REMARKS

The Office Action dated December 18, 2007 has been received and carefully noted. The following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-14 have been rejected. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DeConde et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,889,565, hereinafter "DeConde") in view of Berger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,477,835, hereinafter "Berger"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Applicants respectfully submit that in the present invention, as recited in claim 1, and as clearly described in the specification at page 27, line 24 to page 28, line 3 and shown in Fig. 12, "the narrower portion 26 has an outline at an almost constant spacing from the outline of the sensor section 4." In the construction of the present invention, where the sensor sections 4 are arranged in the vicinities of the intersections of the first wires 2 and the second wires 3 (more precisely, at the intersections of the spaces between every two first wires 2 and the second wires 3), the first wires 2 are formed to have larger-width portions and narrow portions. This helps reduce the intervals at which the sensor sections 4 can be arranged in the direction of the second wires 3. In addition, it achieves an object peculiar to pressure sensors, which is increasing the packing density of the sensor sections 4. Further, it offers a unique

benefit of increasing the area over which the sensor sections 4 receive pressure, thereby enabling them to always detect pressed positions with good sensitivity (see page 28, lines 3-9).

The Office Action admits that primary reference DeConde fails to teach the first wires having larger width portions in spaces between adjacent sensor sections and narrower width portions in the vicinities of the sensor sections and the narrower portions have outlines that are at a substantially constant spacing from outlines of the respective sensor sections. The Office Action relies on secondary reference Berger for these teachings. According to Berger, which is directed to a charge transfer photosensitive device, electrodes or grids 3 (corresponding to the first wires 2 of the present invention) are formed to have larger-width portions and arc-shaped narrow portions (recesses 16).

However, the narrow portions are arranged at predetermined spacings from the reading diodes 5. These reading diodes 5 are for reading the electric charges collected in the photosensitive zones 20 (corresponding to the sensor sections 4 of the present invention), and area each arranged between two photosensitive zones 20 (the rectangular regions arranged in a matrix in Fig. 2, corresponding to the sensor sections 4 of the present invention) adjacent in the column direction, with the reading diodes 5 located alternately between two adjacent columns. Thus, the reading diodes 5 are different from the photosensitive zones 20, and the electrodes or grids 3 do not have an outline at an almost constant spacing from the outline of the photosensitive zones 20. According to Berger, the electrodes or grids 3 are arranged to overlap the photosensitive zones 20. Therefore, to increase the packing density of the

photosensitive zones 20, it is not necessary to form narrow portions in the electrodes or grids 3.

Moreover, even assuming that the reading diodes 5 correspond to the sensor sections 4 in the present invention, the reading diodes 5 are arranged on the side of the insulating layer 22 opposite from the electrodes or grids 3, as shown in Fig. 3 of Berger. Thus, to increase the packing density of the reading diodes 5, it is not necessary to form narrow portions in the electrodes or grids 3. The narrow portions of the electrodes or grids 3 simply form circular recesses 16, around the reading diodes 5, in which to arrange the column grids 4 and the electrodes 7. Accordingly, Berger does not teach or suggest an object of increasing the packing density of sensor sections. Further, the Applicants respectfully submit that combining Berger with DeConde, which is directed to a pressure sensor, involves a jump of logic that is impossible without hindsight.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9 and 11-14 are not obvious over the proposed combination of DeConde and Berger. For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over DeConde in view of Berger.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DeConde modified by Berger as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tamori (U.S. Patent No. 5,526,701, hereinafter "Tamori"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

DeConde and Berger fail to teach or suggest the features of independent claim 1, as discussed above. Tertiary reference Tamori fails to cure the defects of DeConde and Berger. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5 and 6, which depend from claim 1, are not obvious over the proposed combination of DeConde modified by Berger and Tamori. For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over DeConde modified by Berger and further in view of Tamori.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DeConde modified by Berger as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jarvis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,539,554, hereinafter "Jarvis"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

DeConde and Berger fail to teach or suggest the features of independent claim 1, as discussed above. Tertiary reference Jarvis fails to cure the defects of DeConde and Berger. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7, which depends from claim 1, is not obvious over the proposed combination of DeConde modified by Berger and Jarvis. For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over DeConde modified by Berger in further view of Jarvis.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DeConde modified by Berger as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of

McClure (U.S. Patent No. 5,898,235, hereinafter "McClure"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

DeConde and Berger fail to teach or suggest the features of independent claim 1, as discussed above. Tertiary reference McClure fails to cure the defects of DeConde and Berger. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, is not obvious over the proposed combination of DeConde modified by Berger and McClure. For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over DeConde modified by Berger in view of McClure.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

In the event that this paper is not being timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account Number 01-2300, referencing Docket Number 103213-00099.

Respectfully submitted,

Sushupta T. Sudarshan
Registration Number 60,021

Customer Number 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: 202-857-6000
Fax: 202-638-4810

STS:vmh